

Gap assessment in participation of community on the five year (GTP one); as the juncture from MDG to SDG: the case of Gedeo zone education sector, Ethiopia.

Zelalem Alemayehu
University of Gondar, Ethiopia

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the gap of community participation on the five year growth and transformation plan (GTP) I. in the education sector of Gedeo zone (SNNPRS) in Ethiopia in 2015/16. A cross-sectional research design was used to address these objectives. The population were staffs in nine elementary and three high schools in three out of seven Gedeo zone Woredas (provinces). The participants were teachers, principals, students and parents and non-parents as the community representatives. The Woredas in the zone were deliberately selected. This study has revealed that more than 80 percent of participants have reported that they do have the awareness about GTP and there exist the plan in schools; in addition 83 percent of the respondents agreed that there is no considerable gap between the GTP statements regarding community participation and the actual performance of schools but teachers and supervisors were better participants. Moreover, 60 percent of the respondents stated that some leadership styles; high teachers turnover were among challenges; on the other hand good relationship between staff members and students; better resource allocation were good opportunities to achieve better community participation in schools; continuous discussion about the usefulness and implementation of GTP with the community, and inspirational and participatory leadership and sharing responsibilities had become the intention or implication of the majority participants to achieve GTP two in a better way.

Introduction.

Education is a fundamental human right. It provides children, youth and adults with the power to reflect; make choices and enjoy a better life. It breaks the cycle of poverty and is a key ingredient in economic and social development (UNESCO 2008).

In all aspects of the school and its surrounding; educating community, as the rights of the whole child, and all children, to survival, get protection, development and participation are at the centre. This means that the focus is on learning which strengthens the capacities of children to act progressively on their own behalf through the acquisition of relevant knowledge, useful skills and appropriate attitudes; and which creates for children, and helps them create for themselves and others, places of safety, security and healthy interaction. (Bernard 1999).

The new vision of Ethiopian education as stated in the various documents is summarized as follow: Access quality basic education for all; Production of citizens that possess human and national responsibility, having developed problem solving attitude and capacity making them able to participate in the production activities; and Production of lower, middle, and higher level skilled manpower that can participate in various fields of the economic sector and contribute to the country's economic growth and social development; the Five Years (ESDP 2007).

Similarly, the mission of the Ethiopian Education has been established to be the following:

Producing good citizenship; Insure educational equity between urban and rural localities, between male and females as well as among National Regional States of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia; Production of required middle level skilled manpower at reasonable quality and sufficient quantity by establishing technical-vocational training system, and Opening new educational institutions, as well as expanding and strengthening existing ones in order to produce professionals at a quantity and quality levels that match the requirement of the country. Enabling the community to directly participate in the school management and administration with sense of ownership; and building manpower capacity at each level of the system to ensure successful implementation of educational management. Thus, the current educational reform has been set within this context. It is a

total departure from old approach to educational development that has lingered for over 50 years, (ENA for UNESCO 2001).

Education is a social process that needs integration of resources mainly Community's participation and active involvement of Government and any concerned bodies. Nations actually develop Educational policies and plans per their context as usual procedure; likewise, our government has developed the five year transformation and development plan (GTP) which was to be executed during the 2011 _ 2015, in all aspects and sectors. We know that Ethiopia has come across different similar experiences like the Education sector Review (ESR) of the 1971 and the Evaluative Research on the General Education system of Ethiopia (ERGESE) of 1983 are some historical backgrounds.

The previous five year education sector development program, ESDP IV, had the goal of producing democratic, efficient and effective, knowledge based, inspired and innovative citizens who can contribute to the realization of the long term vision of making Ethiopia into a Middle Income Economy. It focuses on educating and/or training the workforce that is demanded by industry, particularly the growing manufacturing industry, at all levels. The plan had also taken into account the findings of the ESDP III review. Using the review as its basis, ESDP IV; that had been developed just earlier than GTP one; had to ensure equitable access to quality education in general, TVET and higher education levels; allowing these sub-sectors to have a strong linkage to, and interrelationship with each other. The key objective over the last five years was to ensure the achievement of the MDGs. **(MoFED 2010).**

The initiatives, already in place to expand basic educational services to all and achieve the MDG goals, was strengthened as the fertile ground to achieve the SDG (2015-2030). A cost effective and participatory early childhood care and education (ECCE) has been expanded in both formal and non-formal delivery mechanisms. The role of the government was to facilitate policy based services, such as, supervision of quality, support of materials, development and provision of curriculum, standards, guidelines, provision of ECCE classrooms, and space within formal primary schools for community driven programs, etc.

With regard to formal education, the existing endeavor to ensure equitable access to quality primary education (EFA) has been continued and strengthened. The gender disparity has been getting eliminate by the end of the plan period. The education strategy for children with special needs was being implemented to meet the needs of this group.

An important priority was being to improve and ensuring the quality and efficiency of education at all levels. To realize this priority, the General Education Quality Improvement Package/GEQIP has been fully implemented. Its subsequent impact in improving student achievement (in terms of knowledge, skill and attitude) was verified through regular monitoring and evaluation schemes; and through the National Assessments of Student Achievement conducted every three years. The findings of which shall serve as inputs to further enrich GEQIP and achieve excellence access to quality education for all. In addition, functional adult literacy (FAL) was expanded to all regions. Youths and adults within the 15-60 age range would participate in the program as per the FAL strategy.

This study therefore examines community participation in regular class education in the district Ethiopia *Woredas* of Gedeo zone namely: *Bule*, *Gedeb*, and *Yirga-Cheffie* town, that exemplify the type of local community initiatives as planned and favored by the government that could be lessons to achieve GTP two and hence SDP.

Regardless of some inconsistencies; the community members in the study area have been found that they were participants in all schools' affairs with good awareness of GTP in the sector under stud, but there existed considerable gap between the plan statements and the actual performance of schools in terms of community participation. Finally, continuous discussions and participatory leadership has been implied as the way forward by the respective community members.

Statement of The Problem.

The top-down approach of international donors and governments, seen as a failure by development practitioners in the late 1980s, gave way in the early 1990s to consulting local people and

generating a sense of ownership, a process commonly referred to as “participation” (White et al. 2007). In many ways the participation approach transformed thinking in international development (White et al. 2007, p. 333).

The concept of participation spread in the 1990s and became what seemed to be the “magic bullet” for successful development projects. However, participatory techniques also are criticized in the development literature (Cleaver et al. 2001). For example, “the community” is often treated as a single, all-encompassing concept. In addition, multiple definitions of participation seem “to obscure differences within target communities, legitimize extractive and exploitative processes of information gathering, [and] impose external agenda” (White 1996, p. 243). In fact, it appears that little is known about how communities and community members understand and interpret community participation activities.

In order to provide sufficient and quality education, there was a need to involve the community at large, NGOs, and private investors in the provision of education and in making them contribute in terms of financial, labor, skill/knowledge, leadership etc. In this regard, they participated actively in building schools, and providing schools with instructional materials, equipment furniture, etc.

Even though, the activities undertaken to improve the quality of education in Ethiopia are promising, they are not in a position to enable students to achieve high learning outcome with its dimensions (input – process – output: outcome). The outcome dimensions are academic, social, emotional, cultural, and environmental (According to the department Of education; youth and Family service: 2004). Thus, taking the experiences of the schools that have good performance in the country and the experiences of other countries, Ethiopia has started a school improvement program (SIP) that is aimed at improving the learning outcome of students. The school improvement framework and other guidelines are prepared with focus on the four main domains which are learning and teaching, school environment, leadership and management and community involvement (MOE, the SIP guideline, Amharic version 2007). This is a new initiative that schools are to implement. While current community participation is very important to implementing School Improvement Program in the general secondary and preparatory school, there are challenges and resistances that hinder its realization in active community participation. As Ayalew (1991) stated, people working in an organization established social relationship and when a change disrupts their relationship, they resist either overtly or covertly to maintain the existing situation.

And hence, me, the researcher as an educator who had more than fifteen years experience in teaching at different levels (from elementary schools to Universities) and working in Education office as vice administrator for two and half years, had been initiated to deal with this research issue as it is timely and it sound highly. In my experience, I knew that, so interesting plans were being set as usual, but the way in which /communities level of participation in education was varied at different degree starting from the outset in the planning stage; this scenario repeatedly reflected by the community and some concerned bodies reported similarly in different occasions. Of course, this can be due to different reasons. These times, our students must be competent enough after accomplishment of certain level or grades in terms of their competency and stated graduates profile in different respective levels, this can be achieved if there is good participation education in different aspects like financial, labour and skill, consultation, and leadership contributions in educational process according to the plan. To achieve this guiding principle, that is achieving of getting competent students at different levels, our government has set the five year **GTP** in the education sector too. Just solving academic problems like the issues of quality; equity; access etc, as the major strategy, the plan has been set and is being practiced. But, especially we teachers are facing such quality related problems in our work atmosphere regardless of such endeavors; some of the problems are like: language incompetency; poor academic achievement; dependency syndrome development, and less knowledge and skill acquisition.

Objectives.

The general objective of this study is to assess the participation gap of community on the five years GTP in Gedeo Zone Education sector.

Specific objectives of this study are.

- (a) To indicate the formal existence and procedures of planning of the GTP part in education sector.
- (b) To what extent do the society (the community) participate to achieve the GTP in education sector?
- (c) To discover the gap between the GTP statements about community participation and the actual performance of education sector in the study area.
- (d) To identify opportunities and challenges of community participation to achieve the GTP particularly in schools.
- (e) To identify the intentions and implications of the community for the betterment of the GTP two achievement in the sector.

2. Literature review.

Globalization, new technology, and changing social patterns have significantly disrupted the education sector over the past decade. National education systems have scrambled to respond to these shifts, which are likely to increase in the future. In that context, transformation is the new normal for education systems. However, many reforms in the sector simply do not work. The specific initiatives may be well-intended, yet they fail during implementation. One major reason is a lack of communication and collaboration—policymakers often fail to sufficiently engage with stakeholders (school administrators, teachers, parents, students, the private sector, and the third sector). As a result, rather than simply crafting individual reforms, education leaders must develop the capability to implement change—they must become transformation leaders. (Dr. Leila Hoteit, 2012).

Stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) are seeking ways to utilize limited resources at their disposal in order to identify and solve problems in the education sector and provide quality education for all children.

Their efforts have in no small way, contributed to realizing the significance and benefit of community participation in education, not only this, their effort have also recognized community participation as one of the strategies to improve educational access and quality. This does not mean that community participation is something new in the education delivery. It, however, did not suddenly appear as panacea to solve complex problems related to education. In actual fact not all communities have played a passive role in children's education. For example, Williams (1994) opined that until the middle of the 19th Century, Europe responsibility for educating children rested with the community. However, we still have some places where communities organize themselves to operate schools for their children today. In preparing and executing any effort to promote community involvement in education, it is pertinent to understand the whole picture of community participation.

The major responsibility of the Ministry of Education is to promote quality education delivery in Ethiopia. This requires adequate resources for the provision of physical facilities, equipment, teaching and learning materials (TLMs), adequate number of trained teachers, and promotion of gender equity in enrolment and retention among others. After 1994, the beginning of the new education and training policy, The Ministry of Education adopted the Education sector development Plan (ESDP), which is a Sector Wide Approach to development assistance, in its quest to ensure quality, equity, relevance, efficiency, and access issues at the national level. Consequently, District Education Offices were directed to develop their District Education Strategic Plan (DESP) in line with the ESDP and the new sectoral policy.

The GTP (2011-2015) initiative is a result-based sector-wide plan which covered all levels and aspects of education such as; Pre-school, Primary, Junior High, Senior High, Teacher education, Special education, Technical/Vocational education and Tertiary education. The thematic areas of the GTP (2011-2015) are; Equitable Access to Education, Quality of Education, Educational Planning and Management, and Science, Technology and Technical Vocational Education and Training (Ministry of Education 2011).

At the Zonal level, the GTP (2011-2015), is operationalized into three distinct plans such as; the, adapted ESR which is a five year plan; the strategic plan, which is a three year rolling plan; and Annual Education Activity Plan (AEDAP) which is a one year plan. These plans though distinct, were

inter-related and inter-dependent. The AEDAP contained issues from the strategic plan which also contained issues from the ESR or the GTP (Ministry of Education, 2010).

Therefore, in society such as Community Based Organizations (CBOs), School Management

Committees/Parent Teacher Associations (SMC/PTAs), Regional education bureau, District Education Office (DEO) and Community and Religious Leaders (CRLs) were to be part of the planning and implementation of the various plans (Ministry of Education, 2010). The ESR, which is a Sector wide Approach to planning, was introduced in the earlier of 1990s because of the disappointment and disenchantment with the traditional planning method. However, it appears that stakeholders' involvement and participation level in the Education Strategic Plan process in the earlier stages is low and has led to low level of support from the stakeholders. Consequently, academic activities appeared slow as most children of school age abandon school for farm and menial jobs, a situation contributing to the low academic standards in the district and child labour. This study aims at assessing the level of stakeholder participation in the Education GTP in the Gedeo zone, in SNNPRS and come out with suggestions that will guide policy decision towards ensuring effective Education Strategic Plan which is the main instrument of the Sector wide Approach to Development Assistance and more importantly to help improve the quality of education within the Zone.

Concept of Participation: Some schools of thought have expressed their opinions on the concept of participation. For instance, Paul (1987) regarded participation as the active process whereby beneficiaries influence the direction and execution of developments rather than merely receiving a share of the project benefits. Also, Simmons (1994) described participation as the ability to control and manage resources not only in a sustainable way, but also in a manner that meets people's social, cultural and economic needs. Adekola (2008) opined that participation is an educational empowering process in which people in partnership with those that are able to assist them identify their needs and increasingly assume responsibility for themselves to plan, manage, control and access the collective actions that are necessary. Participation can therefore be said to be an all involving process whereby beneficiaries feel the sense of belonging in the planning, implementation and sustenance of developmental project in their community.

Defining Community Participation

Community participation is a generalized term that is used to reflect a gamut of levels of involvement with communities. The World Health Organization (WHO) characterizes community participation on three levels: marginal, substantive, and structural. In marginal participation, community input is "limited and transitory and has little direct influence on the outcome of the development activity." Substantive participation is characterized by the community being actively involved in determining priorities and carrying out activities, even though the mechanisms for these activities may be controlled externally. In structural participation, the community is involved as an integral part of the project, and its participation becomes the ideological basis for the project itself. In this last case, the community plays an active and direct part in all aspects of the development process and has the power to ensure that its opinions are taken into account (Sullivan-Owomoyela & Brannelly, 2009).

The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) defines community participation as including both the processes and the activities that allow members of an affected population to be heard, empower them to be part of decision-making processes, and enable them to take direct action on education issues. It uses symbolic/token participation, consultation, and full participation to identify the different levels (INEE, 2004). Another model (Shaeffer, 1994) delineates eight levels of community participation that vary by the degree of engagement and activity. Within this classification system, participation ranges from passive collaboration or involvement with the education system to an actively engaged role (Rose, 2003).

Community Participation in Education

Schools are not the only place where education takes place. It also takes place within families, communities and society. In spite of the various degrees of responsibilities taken by each group, none can take 100% responsibility for educating children. Parents and families cannot be the only group of people for children's education as long as their children interact with and learn from the world

outside their families. Communities and society must support parents and families in the upbringing, socializing, and educating of their children. Schools are institutions that can prepare children to contribute to the upliftment of the society in which they operate, by equipping them with skills that are important in society. Schools cannot and should not operate as separate entities within society.

Since each group plays a different role in contributing to children's education, there must be efforts to harmonize them in order to maximize the contributions. Education therefore takes place most efficiently and effectively when these different groups of people collaborate. In essence, it is important to establish and continuously attempt to develop partnership between schools, parents and communities. Many studies have identified various ways of community participation in education, providing specific ways through which communities can be involved in children's education.

Colleta and Perkins (1995) illustrate various forms of community participation which includes; Research and data collection; Dialogue with policy maker; School management; Curriculum design; Development of learning materials and school construction Henerid and Craig (1996) recognized parent and community support as one of the key factors determining school effectiveness in sub-Saharan Africa. They identify five categories of parent and community support as the following: Children come to school prepared to learn; the community provides financial and material support to the school; Communication between the school, parents, and community is frequent; the community has a meaningful role in school governance; and; community members and parents assist with instruction. The document of **GTP** describes Ethiopia's Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP), as a medium term strategic framework for the five-year period (2010/11-2014/15).

3.METHODOLOGY**3.1 Research Design**

The present study was dedicated to make gap assessment on the community participation in GTP one in the study area, I used the cross-sectional research design. The intensively and collaboratively doing of activities with the community & office staff members and the serious follow up to data investigation have been intended as one of the research activity strategy. Data were to be collected both qualitative and quantitatively and then organized and categorized to be analyzed accordingly. The data analysis was based on direct quantitative calculations as well as percentiles that lead to relative expressions. Finally, the findings were reported both in oral presentation and written reports.

3.2. population, Sampling Techniques And Samples.

The school community in three elementary and a high school in every *Woredas* (district provinces) were the study population. Participant students were selected by simple random sampling, while administrators and community representatives were selected with purposive (Judgmental sampling) technique; 10% staff members (teachers & administration Staff members) as they were homogenous groups were selected by using simple random sampling and the whole teacher_ parents Union members had been the research participants. The total participant teachers in three *Woredas* were 60 and there were two FGD group each comprises 10 participants of which three were students' official representatives; and the remaining were teacher-parent union members of schools. A total of six school principals who were selected purposively were engaged as the interviewee.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments.

This research has used the following data collection instruments: (a) the questionnaire that was both close and open ended questions for teachers from different schools; (b) the FGD that were two groups

comprised of teacher-parent union members and representative students; (c) the interview questions for school principals.

3.3.1 The Questionnaire.

The questionnaire was prepared depending on the realities of schools in that they do have similar plans to ensure quality of education in line with the GTP one part in schools and more of subjective and free responses were inquired as the researcher had recognized during the pilot testing of the questionnaire. And then was administered for sixty teachers in nine different schools based on the percent of teachers in each schools. Totally there were nine questions in which two of them were with the yes/no objective responses and following these were two subjective questions that depended on the yes/no response, and then four independent subjective questions that elicited subjective responses were the part; and finally an objective question that had five scale Likert scale type in that; 1 = never at all to 5 = always that could measure the extent of community participation in schools starting from planning to implementation; evaluation; and feedback. Finally the data had been descriptively analyzed.

3.3.2 The Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide.

Two FGD groups were set in two *Woredas* each has hold ten members from the two most representative *Woredas*. Each group was again comprised of seven parent-teachers union members and three students representatives. The FGD points were five in number but highly explorative and related to the nature and experience of discussant members.

3.3.3 The Interview Guide.

The interview guide was prepared for six school principals (leader). Of course, the nature of the interview questions and that of the FGD were the same with the slight adjustment that enabled to elicit further professional deliveries depending on the principals academic background and experience.

3.4. Data analysis.

The quantitative data were organized and labeled according to their nature after the checks of completeness, these data were descriptively analyzed using SPSS, version 21.0. The mean and standard deviation values were calculated. The FGD; open ended questionnaire parts and interview data had been interpreted in line with the elicited data

4. RESULT.

Introduction

As there were homogenous group participants in the questionnaire of this research, 10% of the total schools teachers were in position to participate in this research. As the questionnaire was administered by the researcher with good explanation and any mistakes were being corrected timely, there were sixty teacher participants who have filled the questionnaire correctly. The total of twenty participants in two groups was engaged in the FGD; and six school principals were the interviewee as well.

I. Quantitative Data Analysis Results:

Descriptive statistics analysis to the following question was reacted by the participant teachers quantitatively to the question how the /community: students, teachers, supervisors, parents, local administrators (government parties) , and other community members of the locality were participating to achieve the objectives of the GTP in schools , just how they were engaged during (a) planning (b) Implementing (c) Evaluation; and (d) Feedback delivery? The response of participant teachers to this questionnaire was labeled as 1 = never at all;

2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = most of the time; 5 = always. And then the data values obtained had been analyzed with the SPSS version twenty one.

Table: 3.1 descriptive statistics result

N (60) = Respondent teachers.

Who participated in GTP execution.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
students	2.00	5.00	3.2500	1.25831
teachers	3.00	5.00	4.0000	.81650
supervisors	3.00	4.00	3.7500	.50000
Parents	2.00	4.00	2.7500	.95743
administrators	2.00	3.00	2.7500	.50000
Other community members	2.00	3.00	2.5000	.57735

Key: mean value ≥ 4.5 = very good; 3.50-4.49 = good; 2.50-3.49 = moderate; 1.5-2.49 = low, and ≤ 1.49 = poor.

From the table: 3.1, descriptive statistics teachers who were with the mean value of four and std. deviation of 0.81650 were the most participants in the implementation of the GTP of the education sector that can be labeled as good. Next to teachers, supervisors of schools were found as good participants in the process of achieving the objectives of the GTP under consideration with the mean value of 3.75 and the std. deviation of 0.5000. On the other hand, students in schools of the study area were found to be the third involving parties in addressing the GTP in their respective schools with the mean value of 3.25 which is moderate, and the standard deviation of 1.25831. Parents and administrators were also found the moderately engaged in the actualization process of the concerned GTP with the mean value of 2.7500 and the standard deviation of 0.95743 and 0.5000 respectively. Finally, the other community members of the surrounding locality were found to be the least involving with the mean value of 2.5 and the std. deviation value of 0.57735.

In addition to this, we can see that teachers in the schools of the study area were taking part in a good way than other, but the greater value of the standard deviation which is 0.82650 indicates that there was some inconsistency among teachers in the regard of engaging in the process of achieving the GTP in education sector; likewise, supervisors also have good mean value again but there was also disparities among them regarding in the involvement of the GTP process. On the other hand, the local administrators and the community have got moderate involvement as well as better consistency among them as they got lesser std. deviation value. Political influence on the way participation takes place is also evident from some qualitative studies. For instance, a case study in Nepal illustrates that participation in legitimate spaces for community participation in school is taking a form of tokenism whereby school management represents only a small number of political elites (Khanal, 2013).

II. Qualitative Data Analysis Results:

Responses Of Participant Teachers To The Respective Qualitative Part Of The Questionnaire.

To the question whether there has been the formal GTP part in school? The participants respond as:

Response- All the respondents respond the yes option.

To the question if your answer to the above question is yes, to what extent the community participate?

Fifty-five out of 60 persons that is 91.6 percent of the total respondents replied that the sectoral GTP has been further contextualized with the community participation to the school environment in the way that can be actualized. That was by developing the three years strategic plan at the school level and then also to be further subdivided in three consecutive yearly operational plans. The remaining 5 respondents that was 8.3 percent of them responds in the way that there is the GTP in the *woredas* education offices level but not in schools.

To the question if your response is yes, how it has been done? Write the process.

Forty-eight in number (80%) of the participants replied that first the draft plan is set according to planning guide given from the education office and then the respective (students,

teachers, parents, supervisors & local administrators, and the community) were invited to evaluate the plan and made some adjustment like the community participation issues that was on financial support, schools leadership and students follow up. And finally the school plans were finalized. The neo-liberal agenda of privatization and the recent upsurge in school-based management (SBM) both imply the importance of community participation for the efficient and effective delivery of educational services (Bruns et al. 2011). On the other hand, 12 persons that were 20 percent of the participants replayed that the plan was drafted and finalized at the offices (the *Woreda* and school) level regardless of others' participation. It requires equality between the full- time school staff and local residents (both parents and non-parents) and development of more central roles, functions and effective communication between school and community. The early history of public schools reveal the existence of a number of conditions which promoted limited rather than wide spread community participation as distinguished from public interest in the operation of the schools, (*Cremin,1951*) in (*Bloomberg, 1971*).

To the question do you think that there was a gap between what has been stated in GTP and what was actually being practiced in terms of community participation in your organization?

Response: 50 persons which was 83.3% of the total participants replay the No option.

To the question if your response is yes to question four, to what extent? Give example.

Response: 17 percent of the respondents have stated the extent of the gap varies from school to school. For example in the achievement of schools, there is the need of community participation in terms of like financial support; so, the less the degree of participation, the less the number of students promotion or academic performance would be in relation to the plan. Colleta and Perkins (1995) illustrate various forms of community participation which includes; Research and data collection; Dialogue with policy maker; School management; Curriculum design; Development of learning materials and school construction Kendall, N (2007) recognized parent and community support as one of the key factors determining school effectiveness in sub-Saharan Africa. They identify five categories of parent and community support as the following: Children come to school prepared to learn; the community provides financial and material support to the school; Communication between the school, parents, and community is frequent; the community has a meaningful role in school governance; and; community members and parents assist with instruction.

To the question what are the problems that hinder to achieve the community participation effectively in the GTP implementation?

Thirty-six respondents that was 60% of the total, has replayed that the type of leadership modality could hinder good community participation. In more concrete terms, there are three essential components of school management/leadership in the theory of SBM, namely, autonomy, assessment, and accountability for improving the learning outcome (Barrera-Osorio et al. 2009; Demas & Arcia, 2015). Other 16 persons that is 26.66 percent of participants respond that economic background of the community matters accordingly and the remaining 10 persons that is 16.66% of the total participants replayed that community's less awareness and less educational background of the community were the problems that hinder in achieving community participation.

Regarding the effect of low-economic background on parents involvement, Molnar (2006) states that the parents either consider themselves unworthy, too they are too oppressed or too disinterested, where as the rich can afford private education, if they are at odds with public system. The above mentioned informants responded that the main obstacle of parents involvement in education was low economic background. Molnar (2006) stated that inadequate, parent straining in the various aspects of education is a barrier to parent's involvement in local school governance. He also stated that the lack of experience is clearly a reason why curriculum and instructional issues were not addressed by parent's councils. Lack of awareness in parents might be due to communication barriers. Communication barriers arise when the idea is not accurately communicated to the community.

To the question what opportunities are there to accomplish the GTP in well participatory approach in your school or sector?

Forty- two persons that is 70 percent of the total respondents replayed that good relationship b/n teachers and students the community and different organizations contributions more over different groupings of students were also considered as good opportunities to run the GTP in more participatory approach. The remaining 18 persons (30%) of the respondents have replayed that relatively becoming better in economic status and awareness of the community was good opportunity for community participation.

To the question what do you suggest to run the GTP implementation in your organization (school) in more participatory way?

Fifty-four persons that is 90% of the participatory replay as suggestion the following Points:-

Continuous discussions with the community mainly on the importance of participation; there is a need of collaboratively working with school like students, teachers, parents and local administrators participatory style of leadership is needed; there is further need of planning & revising together to promote group work where leaders should be the main actors in terms of both their experience and profession; the teacher-parents union should be capacitated and be responsible in the school management activities. School management under autonomy often gives an important role to the school management committee and its school policy formation (Yuki 2016; Igei, and Demas 2016).

FGD Result.

Participants have got good participation and there was also good experience sharing with interesting sense of ownership. Among the three representative *woredas* of Gedeo Zone; in Yirga-Cheffie town administration and in Bule *woredas* (provinces) two FGD groups each hold 10 participants were set and the session has been run to elicit the respective responses to the following questions:

As the discussion point, what is the formal GTP one part in your school? The response of participants from both groups to this question was similar in that, the GTP one part in schools was taken as the part of the government plan that targets mainly in improving quality of education by means of implementing the National education quality improvement package under the specified six program which had been stated in the strategic plans of every school.

To the discussion point, how do you participate in the planning, implementation, evaluation, and feedback stages of this GTP one part in schools? We were participating in all across the continuum of implementation of our GTP one at different level starting from planning, especially in making it contextualized to school context, usually we suggest ideas; forward information and give feedbacks.

To the discussion point, do you think that there is the difference between what is stated in the GTP and actually being practiced in terms of community participation? Fifteen of the twenty participants (75%) of them have said that “no” there was insignificant difference of course at different extent in different schools, but the remaining participants agreed on the existence of considerable difference between the plan and the actual practice than similarities.

To the discussion point, what are the challenges and opportunities to undertake good community participation in implementing the GTP one part in Education sector? All of the participants have agreed that the less awareness of the community about the GTP as well inconvenient school leadership and environment were becoming the challenges to undertake good community participation to implement the GTP in education sector. On the other hand the better allocation of inputs like teachers; instructional materials and other resources as well as relatively nowadays good participation of was considered as opportunities for better implementation of the GTP.

5. What do you suggest to get better community participation in implementing the GTP in Education sector in your surrounding? 90% of the FGD participants have suggested that to implement the GTP in the better way, it is good to make better awareness to the educational and the community at large and develop good communication. Frequent follow up and feedback on the side of technical experts and leaders at different levels is highly needed.

Interview Questions Results:

Six school principals of different schools were the interviewee and have elicited relevant responses using their experience of leadership and academic background in the following ways: To the interview question how the different stakeholder members/community are involved to achieve the **GTP** in your organization (school) in terms of planning, implementation, evaluation, and feedback?

Response: In this interview process six school principals from six schools in three *woredas* (district provinces) have been interviewed. Almost all of them have similar responses to this question in that they said the in particular and the community in general in their respective schools were engaged in times of planning specially in the adjustment process of the plan to the school context; they participated in the process of implementation at different level; undertake evaluation as well as provide feedback in different formal and informal way. But, still there insufficient support of some local administrators and the non-parent community members.

To the interview question is there any difference between what is stated in the **GTP** and the actual practice in terms of community participation?

Four of the six school principal replayed that there is no significant different, but two of them have said that yes there is difference between the GTP statements and the actual performance of community participation due to different reasons like awareness problems and sometimes leadership limitations.

To the interview question what opportunities and challenges have you experienced when you make the **GTP** implementation more participatory in your organization/school?

All of the respondents to this question do have similar reaction in that they said: relatively better resource allocation from the government and increment of ' understanding about the use of education and the meaning of GTP in particular was the opportunity; but still high turnover of teachers, and business of some s well as school environment inconvenience were the challenges to get better participation to address the objectives of GTP.

To the interview question what do you suggest to get better community participation in the implementation of the GTP in your sector (school)?

Five of the six interviewee underlined the importance of continuous awareness creation and devising participatory leadership in schools. But a principal has suggested the need of binding rule that enforces all the concerned bodies to be good participatory in the achievement process of the GTP in education sector specifically in schools.

5. Discussion of Results..

Schools in the study area had the GTP part that had been contextualized to the respective schools context. Of course, the government had had the sectoral GEQIP (general education quality improvement package) and the package was composed of six programs some years earlier than the GTP has become in to being. The strategy of implementing the GEQIP in schools was developing the three years strategic plan that have the series of activities in the way to be done one after the other within three years, and from this, each year's operational plan was being developed and practiced. Meanwhile; the government has launched the GTP one at national level that addresses the different sectors activity to be implemented within five years during 2011 – 2015 G.C, starting from this time, schools were directed to achieve the already set strategic plan and the GTP one sectoral activities. Indeed, the contents of the new plan were the general guidelines that can be realized in the specific strategic plan. The conditions of the different schools in the study area were at different levels of performance mainly due to the internal and external conditions. As procedure of planning, schools were following similar ways in that the plan drafts were sent to schools from the sectoral offices and then school have made this to the context of the schools mainly by participating community. Community participation in the schools indicates activities which are concerned with the determination of school policies and programs, (*Bloomberg* ,1971).

Regarding to the extent of community participations in schools, more than eighty percent of participants have agreed that the community participates at different level mainly in contextualization of the draft plans that come from education offices. The efficiency of schools varied due to the internal and external (mainly the communities conditions) of schools. In relation to the schools internal conditions: the schools leaderships style; the relationship among the school community; the school environment conditions; resources availability were some of the determinant condition to run good community participation. Evidence is expected to accumulate in the coming years, but some of the research on Senegal and Burkina Faso indicate that school autonomy and accountability are moderately associated with educational outcomes such as access to school, learning improvement, and gender equality (Nishimura, unpublished manuscript; Yuki et al., 2016). And hence these conditions have considerable impacts on community participation.

Moreover, external conditions like; the community awareness level towards GTP; becoming busy of many community members and local administrators were also some of the external difficulties to achieve good community participations in schools. Taniguchi and Hirakawa (2016) recently suggested some indirect positive relationship between community participation and learning achievements of pupils through improved school management in rural Malawi. To the contrary twenty percent of respondents replied that the plans were made in offices without invitation of concerned people. Looking from different angles, community participation is found very crucial. From the researchers' point of view, community participation in education may solve educational problems and brings development to the whole system of education. In the policy documents (MOE 1994), it is noted that the provision of access and quality of education is not achievable by government without the participation of community.

In reality, however, parents and community members bear the cost of education in forms other than tuition fees (e.g., contribution, exam fees, development fees, compensatory or remedial lesson fees, etc.), and it is likely that disparities in client power will perpetuate in an unequal society (Ogawa & Nishimura, 2015). When the researcher concern whether school were achieving community participation issues according to what has been stated in the GTP in schools, this research has revealed that more than seventy percent of the respondents of this research have agreed that regardless of schools' differences in achievement, there was insignificant or less different between the actual performance and what has been stated in the plan. But nearly twenty five percent of respondents have agreed the existence of the plan and the achievement difference. But, how to enhance community participation? (BESO II 2003) indicates as living with community, understanding the community, share their problems, involve the community in all aspects in projects, creating openness or transparency and develop the communities sense of ownership are the major factors to play role in community participation in school affaires.

In the study area of this research, respondents of the different data collection instruments similarly reacted that as the opportunity of running good community participation, relatively the awareness increment among the members regarding the GTP; better allocation of resources; betterment of some schools leaders leadership style; good school community relationship, and development of sense of co-operation and team work sprite were mentioned. Also important are information sharing within the community and between community and school, collaboration and coordination among actors within the community and administrative institutions, critical thinking abilities of community members for analyzing government policy and their own needs to initiate action, attitudes of trust and mutual respect among people over school management, untiring efforts to improve, and a spirit of voluntary contribution (Nishimura 2014). But as the challenge, some environmental inconveniencies, teachers high turnover, still luck of understanding among some community members about GTP and their becoming of busy (time constraint); as well as less involvement of the local administrators were the among the common problems mentioned. However, many scholars and researchers do not agree with the idea that time constraint is an obstacle to parents involvement in school works. They argue that time is available if there is an increased level of commitment that determines where time is spent. Molnar (2006) ask supported convoy's stand by stating, if lack of time continues to restrict parents

involvement, it may be an indicator of deeper problem. Molnar described that issue that parents claim may be lack of awareness of the benefit of parent involvement in their children's education.

The participants of this research have identified the intentions of what to be done from their experience in that continuous discussion with different community members regarding the community participation; creating collaborative working systems; developing participatory school leadership behavior and frequent follow up mechanisms; communicating with timely feedbacks, and developing rules that encourage participation were some of the implications given by the participants.

6. Summary

The study revealed that among the section of the community (society) the teachers and supervisors were relatively best participants while students were better but local administrators; parents; and other community members were participating with lesser degree with the parents participation difference were considerably very high among themselves. Moreover; better allocation of resource and good participation of the community in general were among the good opportunities while high turnover of teachers and lower participation of some members of the community were some of the challenges encountered. At the end participants of this research suggested the need of continuous discussions about the issue under consideration and participatory leadership was also proposed as the requirement.

7. Conclusion and Recommendation

Conclusion.

From the statistical outcomes of the respondents in the analysis, the researcher has got the evidence that all the schools in the study area have had the GTP part plan. More than 90% of schools have developed the three years contextualized strategic plan that was the earlier approach that could be reduced to the consecutive three years operational plan by participating the concerned bodies; but the remaining about 10 percent of schools didn't develop the contextualized strategic, and the operational plans. There was considerable inconsistency in terms of participation among the different /community. For example we could see from the responses of the participants that teachers and supervisors had good participation in the implementation of the GTP in schools; while other community members and the community administrators had moderate participation in the engagement process of the GTP execution.

Participants who were about 83 percent of the total, have agreed that there was no considerable gap between statements about community participation in the GTP in the education sector and actually practiced, but 17 percent of participants replied that there was the mismatch like in terms of parents participation; local administrators engagements, and other communities involvements.

More than 60 percent of participants have replied that leadership modalities or styles matters the way and extent of community participation, so; not applying good leadership has become the major problem of achieving good participation. Moreover, better resource allocation, and good relationship between school staffs and students advances the communication between the schools community and the surrounding community. In addition to this, the co-operations of some organizations and individuals; relatively betterment of some community members' economy; and development of students group co-operative learning were among good opportunities. But, high turnover of teachers, and some being busy and awareness gap as well as leadership problems were some problems schools encountered to run good community participation to achieve the GTP parts in education sector.

Creating better awareness via continuous discussions with / the community about the meaning and implementation of the GTP in the education sector as well as adapting transformational /participatory leaderships in schools were the intentions of most research participants. In addition to this, working together from the beginning planning sharing responsibilities of the implementation, evaluation, and the feedback processes as well as by taking lessons from the failure parts of practices had better been the ways forward.

Recommendations:

The concerned government bodies should develop better strategy of supervision and assistance to help schools while planning on community participation to achieve more; and the main or the community in general should develop a system that help to follow the implementation; evaluation, and the feedback strategies of the respective school on the achievement of community engagements on schools GTP parts.

The school principals with should design specific approach that can increase the involvement of local administrators and other community members to make them better participants on the execution process of GTP parts in schools. Moreover, the school community had better understand the importance of community participation and undertake experience sharing practices with schools that have better community participation and act accordingly.

The school community in general and the principals of the respective schools in particular should pay attention to the development of good relationship among the school community and the local people as well that can make communications and hence participations easy.

There is the need of regular discussion program that targets the increment of community participation on schools performance. Schools need to exercise action researches and take corrective measures and interventions accordingly mainly on community participation.

References:

- I. Ayalew shibeshi .(1991). Approach to Educational organization and management. A.A.U unpublished.
- II. Bernard, A. (1999). The child-friendly school: a summary. Paper written for UNICEF: New York
- III. Bloomberg, War ner Jr. (1971). *Community participation in the school system*. In Deighton (ed). The Encyclopedia of Education: USA volume 2, PP 335-341. The Macmilla Company and Free Press.
- IV. Barrera-Osorio, B., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibáñez, L. (2009). Decentralized decision-making in schools: The theory and evidence on school-based management. Washington, DC: The World Bank
- V. Bruns, B., Filmer, D., & Patrinos, A. (2011). Making schools work: New evidence on accountability Reforms. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- VI. Cleaver, H. (2001) Fostering Family Contact. London: The Stationery Office.
- VII. Colletta, N.J; and G Perkins, (1995). "Participation in Education" environmental department papers, participation series, paper No 001, environmental development. Word bank. Washington, D.C
- VIII. Demas, A., & Arcia, G. (2015). What matters most for school autonomy and accountability: A framework paper. SABER Working Paper Series, 9. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
- IX. Khanal, P. (2013). Community participation in schooling in Nepal: A disjunction between policy intention and policy implementation? Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 33(3), 235–248.

- X.** Kendall, N (2007). Parental and Community Participation in Improving educational Quality in Africa: Current Practices and Future Possibilities. *International Review of Education*, November 2007, Vol. 53, issue 5-6, pp.701-708.
- XI.** MOE(2010). Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV); program Action plan; .Addis Ababa.
- XII.** Molnar C. (2006). Parent and Teacher views of parent involvement in local governance. A summary of Masters' Thesis. University of Regina.
- XIII.** Nishimura, M. (2014). An analysis of "governance" to improve quality of education in the post-MDGs era: The case of household learning assessment in Kajiado Country, Kenya. *Africa Educational Research Journal*, 5, 20–34 (In Japanese).
- XIV.** Ogawa, K., & Nishimura, M. (Eds.). (2015). Comparative analysis of universal primary education policy and practice in sub-Saharan Africa: The cases of Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, and Uganda. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- XV.** Taniguchi, K., & Hirakawa, Y. (2016). Dynamics of community participation, student achievement, and school management: The case of primary schools in a rural area of Malawi. *Compare*, 46(3), 479–502.
- XVI.** UNESCO. (2008). Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2009: Governance. Paris: UNESCO.
- XVII.** White, S.C.(1996). Depoliticising development: The uses and abuses of participation and development in practice, 6(1), 6-15.
- XVIII.** Yuki, T., Igei, K., & Demas, A. (2016). Measuring quality of policies and their implementation for better learning: Adapting World Bank's SABER tools on school autonomy and accountability to Senegal. JICA-RI working paper No. 113. Tokyo: International Cooperation Agency Research Institute.